

**REMARKS**

**I. Introduction**

At the time of the Office Action dated November 30, 2006, claims 1-10 were pending in this application. Of those claims, claims 4-10 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.142(b).

In this Amendment, claims 1-3 have been amended, and claims 4-10 have been canceled, without prejudice, reserving right to prosecution in a continuation application. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Support for the amendments of the claims can be found in, for example, the first full paragraph at page 7, the paragraph bridging pages 9-10, and the paragraph bridging pages 10-11 of the specification. A Request for Continued Examination is filed herewith.

**II. The Rejection of Claims 1-3**

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al. In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Lee et al. disclose a plasma display panel identically corresponding to what is claimed.

It is well established precedent that the factual determination of lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the identical disclosure in a single reference of each element of the claimed invention, such that the identically claimed invention is placed into the possession of one having ordinary skill in the art. *See Helifix Ltd. v. Blok-Lok, Ltd.*, 208 F. 3d 1339, 54 USPQ2d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Electro Medical Systems S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences, Inc.*, 34 F.3d 1048, 32 USPQ2d 1017 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Applicant submits that Lee et al. do not disclose a plasma display panel including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1, as amended. Specifically, Lee et al. do not disclose, at a minimum, “at least one of the first dielectric layer and the second dielectric layer in plane view has four corners with a radius of curvature of other than zero, and each of the four corners is where two sides of the substantially rectangular shape meet,” recited in claim 1.

Lee et al. simply disclose a method of forming a groove (including a recess and a rounded recess) between sustain electrodes in a dielectric layer, in order to lower a discharge starting voltage. In the Office Action, the Examiner, referring to rounded recess 63 shown in Fig. 7, asserted that dielectric layer 43 of Lee et al. has a corner with a radius of curvature of other than zero.

However, Lee et al. do not disclose any corner, where two sides of a substantially rectangular shaped dielectric layer meet, have a radius of curvature of other than zero. Even if it is assumed for the sake of this response that dielectric layer 43 has a rectangular shape, there is no disclosure in Lee et al. that a corner, where two sides of the rectangular dielectric layer 43 meet (see, e.g., Fig. 7), has a radius of curvature of other than zero.

For example, the rectangular shaped dielectric layer of a plasma display panel having four corners with a radius of curvature of other than zero, as claimed, may decrease concentration of reaction force on the four corners of the dielectric layer, avoiding the cracking and chipping of the dielectric layer starting at the four corners. Accordingly, it may be possible to eliminate insulation failure of the dielectric layer, and to produce high quality plasma display panels. These advantages are not disclosed by Lee et al.

Based on the foregoing, Lee et al. do not disclose a plasma panel including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1, as amended, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102.

**Application No.: 10/507,312**

Dependent claims 2 and 3 are also patentably distinguishable over Lee et al. at least because these claims respectfully include all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully solicits withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and favorable consideration thereof.

### **III. Conclusion**

It should, therefore, be apparent that the imposed rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty  
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080  
as our correspondence address.**

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:TT  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: February 27, 2007**

WDC99 1353524-1.043890.0688